



RECEIVED

OCT 25 2002

Technology Center 2100

The updating step is alleged by the Office Action to be disclosed at col. 14, lines 28-35. This citation discloses only that the registers 312, 322 and 314, 324 are updated after each transfer of data. This citation does not disclose via what element this updating is done. To determine what element is involved, reference is made to col. 10 of Bowes et al. There this reference discloses that updating is done

when adder 370 is activated by an address increment signal over control line 375, the adder 370 will increment the address in the currently active register set by 16 and store this new address in the address register of the currently active register set.

Col. 10, lines 45-49. Referring to Fig. 3 of Bowes et al., registers 314, 324 and 312, 322 are updated by outputs of adders 380, 370, respectively. The connection from the outputs of adders 370, 380 to the inputs of registers 314, 324 and 312, 322 is neither bus 210 nor bus 214. Therefore, Bowes et al. do not identically show the claim 1 features of (a) retrieving a first portion of the recorded data via the bus and (b) updating some of the registers via the bus. Claim 1 is then not anticipated by Bowes et al. and is allowable. Claims 2-5 are also allowable due to their dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claim 6 features retrieving via the DMA controller several values indexed by zone identifier Z_B . The Office Action contends that Bowes et al. disclose this feature at col. 5 line 42 to col. 6, line 13. However, that cited disclosure does not disclose that feature. That specific disclosure explains how data is transferred between the I/O device, DMA FIFO and CPU memory. There is absolutely no explicit or inherent disclosure of indexing by zone identifier Z_B , much less a zone identifier. Since Bowes et al. do not disclose this feature, claim 6 is not anticipated and is allowable. Claims 7-14 are also allowable due to their dependence on allowable claim 6.

Claim 15 features "a memory containing several values indexed by zone identifiers." Nowhere does Bowes et al. mention zones or disclose anything related to zones. Therefore, Bowes et al. do not disclose "values indexed by zone identifiers." The Office Action states that "it is obviously a memory containing several values." Assuming arguendo that is correct, there is nothing in Bowes et al. that leads to those



values being indexed by zone identifiers. While this appears to be is an inherency argument, to establish inherency the extrinsic evidence "must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill." Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264, 1268, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Bowes et al. fail on this point also. Simply because the memory has values does not necessarily mean those values are indexed by zone identifiers. As a result, claim 15 is not anticipated by Bowes et al. and is allowable.

As explained above, all the pending claims are patentable over the applied reference. The examiner is respectfully requested to allow all the pending claims and pass this case to issuance.

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2002

Respectfully submitted,

Technology Center 2100

SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC
(Assignee of Entire Interest)

Date

10/16/02

David K. Lucente
David K. Lucente, Reg. No. 36,202
SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC
Intellectual Property Dept. - COL2LGL
389 Disc Drive
Longmont, Colorado 80503
(720) 684-2295 (telephone)
(720) 684-2588 (facsimile)